



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/688,465	10/16/00	SCHATZLER	B GR 97 P 1049

LAURENCE A GREENBERG  
P O BOX 2480  
HOLLYWOOD FL 33022

MM41/1003

EXAMINER

PAREKH, N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2811

DATE MAILED:

10/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY**

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/688,465

Applicant(s)  
Schatzler

Examiner  
Nitin Parekh

Art Unit  
2811

-- Th MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Apr 12, 2001
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 35 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirements.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

## Attachment(s)

- 15) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 16) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 19) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 17) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 3 20) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Art Unit: 2811

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 2, line 3 cites: “a hollow groove formed on the integrated circuit by an adhesive”.

However, Fig. 1 and 2 and the specification disclose formation of a fillet (5 in Fig. 1) of an adhesive at the notch/groove/overhang portion of the island. It is not clear where a hollow groove is formed by an adhesive.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2811

4. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al (US Pat. 5773878) in view of the admitted prior art (APA- Inaba, US Pat. 4258381).

Regarding claims 1 and 3, Lim et al disclose an electronic component comprising :

- a housing made of a casting/molding compound (24 in Fig. 2)
- an integrated circuit (IC) having base area (20 in Fig. 2)
- a lead frame (100 in Fig. 2) having an island/die pad with a continuous/unpatterned base area supporting the IC (14 in Fig. 2; Col. 1, line 33), the base area of the IC being smaller than that of the island, and
- the IC and the island being embedded in the housing so that a thickness of the housing region above the IC is substantially equal to that below the island (Fig. 2 and 4A; Col. 3, line 30) for avoiding deformation/flexure of the molding compound/casting (Fig. 1-4B; Col. 1, line 20- Col. 4, line 40).

Lim et al disclose the ratio between the length/horizontal dimension of the IC and the island/die pad being 0.75 (as measured from the dimensions in Fig. 2) but fail to specify the ratio between the base area of the IC and that of the island/die pad being 0.7- 0.9 for avoiding the flexure of the housing. Lim et al further disclose the island/die pad being square in shape (Col. 1, line 35).

The APA teaches using the IC and the island having conventional square shapes (Col. 4) and using a range of island dimensions to support various chip sizes (Col. 2, line 55).

Art Unit: 2811

Furthermore, it is a matter of design choice to select the parameters such as the dimensions of the IC chip including width, shape, etc. to achieve the desired base area supporting the IC, overall package size and electrical/thermal performance for the lead frame package.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to select ratio between the base area of the IC and that of the island/die pad of 0.7- 0.9 for avoiding the flexure/deformation and to improve the reliability using the APA's component design in Lim et al's housing.

Regarding claim 2, Lim et al disclose an adhesive bonding of the IC to the island (Col. 2, line 9) and a fillet being formed by emerged adhesive at the notch/groove/overhang portion of the island (Fig. 2),

Regarding claim 4, Lim et al disclose the lead frame including the leads being conventionally bonded/routed to the island (Col. 2, line 11).

Regarding claim 5, Lim et al disclose the lead frame including the leads being vertically centered within the housing and the island being vertically lowered with respect to the leads (Fig. 2).

Art Unit: 2811

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lim et al (US Pat. 5773878) in view of the admitted prior art (APA- Inaba, US Pat. 4258381).

The teachings of Lim et al and the APA apply to claim 6 as explained above for claim 1.


Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2811 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit via Technology Center 2800 fax center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 4C23. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Parekh whose telephone number is (703) 305-3410. The examiner can be normally reached on Monday-Friday from 08:30 am-5:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tom Thomas, can be reached on (703) 308-2772. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-7722 or 7724.

Nitin Parekh

09-28-01



TOM THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800